

To: Hylton Jackson (Hylton.Jackson@dnr.iowa.gov)[Hylton.Jackson@dnr.iowa.gov]
From: McCoy, Erin
Sent: Fri 1/27/2017 1:45:09 PM
Subject: FW: Des Moines TCE/Dico South Pond Remedial Alternatives/FS
Des Moines TCE South Pond Remedial Alternatives, Rev. 1.pdf

Hylton, attached is the revised feasibility study for the SPA for the Dico site. Please let me know asap if you have any questions or comments. I would like to approve this by next Wednesday if at all possible. Thanks!



Erin McCoy, P.G. | Remedial Project Manager

EPA Region 7 | Superfund Division | Superfund Remediation Branch

11201 Renner Blvd | Lenexa, KS 66219

Phone: 913.551.7977

mccoy.erin@epa.gov | www.epa.gov

From: Williams, Mike [mailto:Mike.Williams@tetrattech.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 3:30 PM
To: McCoy, Erin <McCoy.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Des Moines TCE/Dico South Pond Remedial Alternatives/FS

Erin:

Please find attached the revised South Pond remedial alternatives (aka, FS) document. Chit had a few responses to comments that he wanted to include (see below). If you have any questions or require any changes, please let me know.

Thanks,

Mike

The following are responses to selected comments that warrant a response:

Pg. 33 of PDF file. EPA Comment: Why couldn't we put the settled material back in the pond area before filling to avoid off site disposal? This would prevent LDRs from being activated.

Tt Response: LDRs would be triggered because we are not using CAMUs.

Pg. 33 of PDF file. EPA Comment: Why do we need a RCRA cap? Can't we use asphalt like the rest of the site and just level the area?

Tt Response: The first paragraph of Section 5.3 explains the need for a RCRA cap. We have added an optional cost for an asphalt cap. Neither cap would be level with the ground. They would both be slightly raised to allow for long-term settlement.

Pg. 56 of PDF file. EPA Comment: The cost for the frac tank seems cheap. Please double check this.

Tt Response: We have a rental quote lower than the price used in the cost estimate.

Pg. 57 of PDF file. EPA Comment: Question on acreage. The text keeps indicating that this is less than an acre (0.25 acres for wetland restoration above). Do we have to figure this in as whole numbers? Is that why it's 2 (2X wetlands destroyed)? If so, I'm fine with that, but want to understand why this conflicts with text. May need to add a comment to the bottom of this to explain why.

Tt Response: In Alternative SP2, there is only 0.25 acres of wetland restoration because the entire pond is not destroyed. However, in Alternative SP3, the entire pond is destroyed. The pond area is approximately 0.8 acres. We rounded up to 1 acre to account for potential damage to wetlands outside the pond, then used the 2:1 mitigation ratio to estimate purchase of 2 wetland credits. However, credits don't have to be purchased in whole number increments. For example, one could purchase 1.6 credits if one wanted. Some explanatory text has been added to the cost estimate.